

THE KENTUCKY GAZETTE.

No. 808.]

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1802.

[Vol. XV

LEXINGTON—PRINTED BY JOHN BRADFORD, (On Main Street)—PRICE TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, PAID IN ADVANCE.

Congress of the United States. Senate.

Wednesday, January 13, 1802.

DEBATE

On Mr. Brockenridge's motion to repeal
the act passed last session, for a
new organization of the
JUDICIARY SYSTEM.

[Mr. Mason, in continuation.]

[Mr. Mason went into an examination of the number of suits depending at the time the law was passed, and particularly the number brought within the twelve months preceding its passage, from the fewest of which, and their being in a state of diminution rather than increase he inferred the inutility of the additional judges.]

He continued: If on this review, we find the number of suits decreasing instead of increasing; if the courts then established were found competent to the prompt and faithful discharge of all the duties devolved upon them, the law was unnecessary; and if unnecessary, the additional expense incurred by it was unnecessary; and all unnecessary expense should be saved. It is true that 50,000 dollars divided among the people of the United States amounted to but one cent a man; but the principle was still the same. It has been very fashionable of late to justify every unnecessary expense by stating each item by itself and dividing it among the whole people. In this way every expense is held forth as of little consequence. Gentlemen say in this case it is only one cent a man! In the case of the Mauleum, 200,000 dollars came to only 4 cents a man! In the direct tax, it is only 40 cents! They talk of our army, it only comes to a few cents for each person, who may sell as many cabbages to the soldiers themselves as to pay it! So in a navy. In this way the most extravagant expenses will drop down to a mere fraction. But this kind of federal arithmetic I can never accede to. It may suit an expensive government; but it is an imposition upon the people.

It has been urged with some force by the gentleman from New-York and Connecticut that the small number of suits is an evidence of the efficacy and ability of our courts of justice. I am willing to admit the force of this remark; but I must apply it very differently from those gentlemen. I must apply it to the rate of dockets when this law was passed; & from their being very few at the time, I must infer that the system existing then was an excellent one, as it enabled the power of the laws to effectually, that there was but little necessity for enforcing the law against delinquents.

From the remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut it might be inferred that we were about to destroy all our courts, and that we were in future to have no courts. Is this the case? Are we contending for breaking down the whole judiciary establishment? On the contrary we barely say the courts you had before the passage of this law, were sufficient; return, therefore, to them. This law which we repealed, imparts no new authorities to your judges; it clothes them with no additional terrors, it adds not to their axes, or increases not the number of their rods. It only enlarges their number, which was before large enough.

The gentleman from New-York has adorned himself with a great deal of handsome rhetoric. But I apprehend without bearing much upon the question. There is one idea, however, which he has seized with exultation, the idea of a great state kneeling at the altar of federal power, and he deplores that this spectacle, the more sublime that his imagination can conceive, is vanished forever. But if he will confute those stories of history with which he so often amuses and instructs his audience, he will find still more splendid humiliations. He will find the proud monarchs of the earth, surrounded with all the decorations of royalty, dragged at the chariot wheel of the conqueror. In more modern times, he will behold a King of England and of France, one holding the fire-axe and the other the bride, while the Pope mounted his horse.—If not con-

tented with the contemplation of these illustrious degradations, he may resort to sacred writ, to which he so often appeals; and in the very book of judges, he will behold a famous king of Jerusalem, surrounded by three score and ten dependent kings, picking up the crumbs from under his table, and what made the humiliation more charming, all these kings had their thumbs and great toes cut off.

But if the gentleman from New-York wishes to be gratified with a more modern idea of sovereign degradation, I would refer him to the memorable threat of an individual, a servant of the people, to humble a whole state, a great state too, in dust and ashes. A state upon her knees before six venerable judges, decorated in party-colored robes, as our former were, or arrayed in more solemn black, such as that they have lately assumed, hoping, though a state, that it might have some chance for justice, exhibits a spectacle of humble and degraded sovereignty far short of the dreadful denunciation to which I allude! If the gentleman feels, as I know many do, rapture at the idea of a state being humiliated and tumbled into the dust, I envy him not his feelings. At such thought I acknowledge I feel humbled. If the degradation were confined to kings and tyrants, to usurpers who had deluged the liberties of nations, I should not feel much commiseration; but when applied to governments, instituted by the people for the protection of their liberties, and administered only to promote their happiness, I feel indignant at the idea of degraded sovereignty. I should feel the same interest for any state, large or small, whether it were the little state of Delaware herself, or the still more insignificant republic of St. Marino.

After a few additional remarks, and asking the indulgence of the house, for the want of method imposed upon him from the necessity of replying to the arguments of gentlemen as they had stated them, General Mason sat down.

Mr. Strong, of North-Carolina. The importance of the present question might I presume justify any member in delivering his sentiments without apology. But from the able manner in which the subject has already been discussed, I should have been induced to adhere to my usual course since I have been a member of this body, and leaving its elucidation to others of greater experience and more talents, have been contented with a silent vote. As however, the state whose servant I am, and whose faithful servant I wish at all times to be found, has instructed her members on this subject, I will endeavor in the plain way of which alone I am capable to assign the reasons for my vote. And in doing this, I rather wish than hope that I may state any thing worthy the consideration of this enlightened assembly.

The argument upon this question has naturally divided into two parts, the one of expediency—the other of constitutionality. If the repeal of this law shall be deemed expedient; the Senate will doubtless consider it their duty to repeal it if no constitutional objection opposes it; but if it shall be deemed unconstitutional to repeal it, then no considerations of expediency can stand in the way of that solemn instrument, we are all sworn to support.

Before entering into an examination of the expediency of the repeal, it may be proper to remark that gentlemen who have spoken against the repeal, whose talents and eloquence I highly admire, have not correctly stated the question.

The true question is, not whether we shall deprive the people of the United States of all their courts of justice; but whether we shall reform to them their former courts. Shall we, or shall we not, continue an experiment made, or attempted to be made, I will not say improperly, because my respect for this body and for my country forbid the imputation; but I will say that the length of time we remained without this system, and the repeated ineffectual attempts made to establish, present strong reasons for inferring that there are not those great apparent reasons in favor of it that have been stated. A system, somewhat similar to the present, had been rejected by the legislature because they preferred the former system. Another evidence to the same purpose is, that during the last session when the subject was again re-

vived, and the present plan adopted, an amendment was offered, to amend by extending and enlarging the former establishment.

[Here Mr. Stone read the amendment proposed, which augmented the number of judges of the Supreme Court, and assigned their circuits.]

This amendment was rejected, and from the vote entered on the journal of that day, it appears that the difference of votes against the amendment was formed of those gentlemen, who were nominated to appointments made vacant by the promotion under the new law, I do not state this circumstance as an evidence that these gentlemen were influenced by improper motives; but to shew that the manner in which the new system was formed was not calculated to establish in the public mind a decided preference of it over the old system.

Having made these remarks on the great deliberation said to have been manifested in the adoption of this plan. I hope I may be permitted to express my perfect coincidence with the gentleman from Connecticut, that courts are necessary for the administration of justice, and that without them our laws would be a dead letter.

But it appears to me essential to the due administration of justice, that those who preside in our courts should be well acquainted with the laws which are to guide their decisions. And I apprehend that no way is so much calculated to impart this knowledge as a practical acquaintance with them by attending courts in the several states, and hearing gentlemen, who are particularly acquainted with them, explain and discuss them. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary in my mind, that the judges of the supreme court, whose power controls all the other tribunals, and on whose decisions rest the property, the reputation, the liberty, and the lives of our citizens, should, by riding the circuits, render themselves practically acquainted with their duties. It is well known that the knowledge of the laws of a state is not to be suddenly acquired, and it is reasonable to conclude that that knowledge is most correctly possessed by men whose whole life has been devoted to the acquisition. It is also perfectly well known that the knowledge of the modes and principles of practice in the different states, or of any state, is most effectually to be acquired in courts where gentlemen of skill and experience apply those principles to use upon existing points.

This defect then, of the present plan is in my opinion, so radical, that of itself it would decide with me the question of expediency.

With regard to the expence of this new system, I will say that it weighs as much as it is worth. The single consideration of an expenditure of 30,000 dollars may not be deemed of much importance, when weighed with the benefits derived from an administration of justice over this extensive country. If this great object can be better effected with the additional expense, then it is proper to consider whether the amelioration is worth the price; but if it is not better effected, it surely cannot be the wish of any gentleman to incur a useless expense. If, when this law was passed, the business, to the transaction of which the old courts were fully competent, was lessening, then surely there was no occasion for additional tribunals.

The more important consideration involves the constitutional question: Can we, according to that sacred instrument, repeal this law, and destroy the offices created by it? If we cannot, I hope the Senate will reject the proposition on your table.—But if we can, as on examination I think we may, I trust the resolution will be adopted.

The gentleman from Kentucky, who introduced this subject, has so fully and forcibly stated that part of the argument which establishes, that the office of judge being declared by the constitution to be during good behavior, must evidently apply to existing offices, and not to contest the power of the legislature in doing away offices, that I shall not touch it.

I have taken a view of the constitution, which though new in this argument, appears to me to be correct and conclusive. The 4th section of the ad article of the constitution declares that "the President, the Vice-President and all civil officers of

the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors."

This section being added to the article establishing the executive power, evidently operates as a retribution and curb to that power—to prevent the President, Vice-President or any officer in the appointment of the President from remaining in office, when, in the opinion of the legislature, the public good requires them to be displaced. The practical construction put upon this article in connection with other parts of the constitution, is, that all officers in the appointment of the President may be removed at his will; but that those officers, together with himself and Vice-President, shall be removed upon impeachment and conviction by the legislature. No part of the constitution expressly gives the power of removal to the President; but a construction has been adopted and practised upon from necessity, giving him that power in all cases in which he is not expressly restrained from the exercise of it. The judges afford an instance in which he is expressly restrained from removal. It being declared by the 1st section of the 3d article of the constitution, that the judges both of the supreme & inferior courts shall hold their offices during good behavior.—They doubtless shall (as against the President's power to retain them in office) in common with other officers of his appointment, be removed from office by impeachment & conviction; but it does not follow that they may not be removed by other means. They shall hold their offices during good behavior, and they shall be removed from office upon impeachment and conviction of treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors. If the word impeach of high crimes and misdemeanors, be understood according to any construction of them hitherto received and established, it will be found that although a judge guilty of high crimes and misdemeanors, is always guilty of misbehavior in office, yet that of the various species of misbehavior in office, which may render it exceedingly improper that a judge should continue in office, many of them are neither treason, nor bribery, nor can they properly be dignified by the appellation of high crimes and misdemeanors. And for the impeachment of which no precedent can be found; nor would the words of the constitution justify such impeachment. To what source then shall we resort for a knowledge of what constitutes this thing called misbehavior in office? The constitution surely did not intend that a circumstance so important as the tenure by which the judges hold their offices, should be incapable of being ascertained. Their misbehavior certainly is not an impeachable offence; still it is the ground upon which the judges are to be removed from office. The process of impeachment, therefore, cannot be the only one by which the judges may be removed from office, under and according to the constitution. I take it, therefore, to be a thing undeniable that there resides somewhere in the government a power to declare what shall amount to misbehavior in office by the judges, and to remove them from office for the same without impeachment. The constitution does not prohibit their removal by the legislature, who have the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the constitution in the government of the United States. But, says the gentleman from New-York, the judges are officers instituted by the constitution to save the people from their greatest enemies, themselves—and therefore they should be entirely independent of, and beyond the control of the legislature.—If such was the design of those wise men who framed and adopted the constitution, can it be presumed they would have provided so ineffectual a barrier as these judges could readily be thrown to be?

It is allowed on all hands, the legislature may modify the courts—they may add judges, they may fix the times at which the courts shall sit, &c. Suppose the legislature to have interests distinct from people—and the judges to stand in the way of executing any favorite measure. Can any thing be more easy than for the legislature to declare that the courts instead of being held semi-annually, or oftener, shall be held only once in six, eight, ten, or twelve years; or in order to free them to

from the opposition of the present Supreme Court to declare, that court shall hereafter be held by thirteen judges. An understanding between the President and the Senate would make it practicable to fill the new offices with men of different views and opinions from those now in office.—And what, in either case, would become of this boasted protection of the people against themselves. I cannot conceive the constitution intended so feeble a barrier—a barrier to easily evaded.

What danger is there to the people from the legislature which the courts can control? The means of oppressing nearly at hand to the legislature, and which afford the strongest temptation to their use, are, the raising extravagant and unnecessary sums of money, and the employing large and useless armies.—Can the courts oppose effectual checks to these powers? I presume not. The constitution permits their exercise to any extent within the direction of the legislature.

The objects of courts of law, as I understand them, are, to settle questions of right between parties—to enforce obedience to the laws—and to protect the citizens against the oppressive use of power in the executive officers.—Not to protect them again the legislature; for that I think I have shewn to be impossible with the powers which the legislature may safely use and exercise; and because the people have retained in their own hands the power of controlling and directing the legislature, by their immediate and mediate elections of President, Senate and House of Representatives.

It is not alone the sixteen rank and file, which the gentleman from New-York has so ludicrously depicted, that I apprehend immediate danger from; but it is the principle which converts the office of judge into an hospital of incurables, and declares that an expiring faction after having lost the public confidence, may add to those 16 until they become 1600, or 16000; and that the restored good fens of the legislature, the whole government and constitution retains no means of calling them off, but by destroying itself and resorting to revolutionary principles.—The legislature may repeal unnecessary taxes, may disband useless and expensive armies, may declare they will no longer be bound by the stipulations of an oppressive treaty; and if w^t should follow the constitution is still safe. But if the construction which gentlemen contend for be correct, a band of drones to any amount in number under denomination of the judges, may prey upon the substance of the people, and the government retains not the power to remove them but by destroying the constitution itself.

I beseech this enlightened assembly to pause before they adopt a construction capable of producing so great mischief, and so ineffectual to the ends proposed.

The question is not now, as it would seem from the arguments of gentlemen, they understand it to be; whether we shall abolish offices without compensating the officers for the sacrifices they may have made. If a proposal to compensate them shall be brought forward, the legislature will surely do what honor and justice shall require.

If I possessed equal powers of speech with the gentleman from Connecticut, I might be tempted to make as impulsive an address to the feelings of the Senate. Sure I am, I feel as deep an interest in, and solicitude for the constitution, as that gentleman. I view it with him as the bond of our union and the foundation of our safety. But it must be supported on reasonable and practical grounds. My understanding is incapable of seeing how the absurdities and evils of the construction contended for, can be avoided. I hope therefore that the power of the legislature to put down well as to build up, courts of justice, as the public good may require, will be established.

Not having accustomed myself to deliver my sentiments in this or the other branch of the legislature, I may not have comprised them in so forthright a compass, nor in such orderly shape, as would be proper in submitting them to this enlightened assembly. If, however, I have succeeded in stating intelligibly the grounds of my conviction, I am satisfied. If my remarks have contributed to elucidate the subject to others, I shall rejoice; but if failing in this, they also are mixed with error, I trust gentlemen will set them right.

Mr. OLcott, of New-Hampshire, said this subject was of the most important kind, and though many able arguments had been already offered, he could not pass it over with a negative vote.

It has been suggested that the act, now proposed to be repealed, came in on the

influx of passion, and that the influx of reason should sweep it away.—He did not know that this was the case. Some gentlemen contend that it was adopted with great deliberation.

He thought the reasons for a repeal of this law insufficient. It is not said, that if the constitution vests a right to office in the judges, that we can affect them. He thought the constitution did vest the right, and he held it to be sacred.

The provisions of the constitution appeared to him to plain, that they scarcely admitted of illustration. He who undertakes to explain the text must find more explicit terms than those contained in it. He could not find any.

After dwelling upon the different provisions of the constitution, Mr. Olcott went upon the question of expediency at some length, and concluded that a repeal was as inexpedient as unconstitutional.

Mr. COCKE, of Tennessee, followed Mr. Olcott. He said he was sorry gentlemen attempted to make quick doctors of them, by saying we may give a wound, but cannot heal it. He wished the Senate to enquire whether the law now proposed to be repealed was constitutional or not. If it was not, we should act like honest men, acknowledge that we have violated the constitution, and restore it to its purity by repealing the law. Let us recur to the journals of 1799, and see what was the understanding of these champions of our liberties, and whether they have not since changed. The Journals would prove that the judges were to mix with the legislature, were to be locked up in a closet, and to declare who was to be our executive magistrate.

[Mr. Cocke went into an examination of the arguments on the constitutional point.]

We have been told that the nation is to look up to these immaculate judges to protect their liberties—to protect the people against themselves. This was novel, and what result did it lead to? He chaffered to think of it. Were there none of these judges ready to plunge their swords in the American heart? He did not think it proper to be alarmed by the terrors held out. He wished to know no man; to take things as they are. But if gentlemen will attack, they must expect arreys.

Mr. Cocke then dilated upon the several points of the discussion and concluded with the expression of the hope that the legislature would repeal the law, and that they would not give way to the ideas of gentleman that the government was made for a chosen few—for the judges to whom we are to look up for every thing.

MR. MORRIS.—Mr. President, I had fostered the hope that some gentleman who thinks with me, would have taken upon himself the task of replying to the observations made yesterday, and this morning, in favor of the motion on your table. But since no gentleman has gone so fully into the subject as it seems to require, I am compelled to request your attention.

We were told yesterday, by the honorable member from Virginia, that our objections were calculated for the bystanders, and made with a view to produce effect upon the people at large. I know not for whom this charge is intended. I certainly recollect no such observations.

As I was personally charged with making a play upon words, it may have been intended for me. But surely, sir, it will be recollect that I declaimed that paltry game, and declared that I considered the verbal criticism which had been relied on, as irrelevant. If I can recollect well what I thought, and meant to say, sure I am that I uttered nothing in the style of an appeal to the people.—I hold no member of this house has so poor a sense of its dignity as to make such an appeal. As to myself it is now nearly thirty years since I was called into public office. During that period I have frequently been the servant of the people, always their friend; but at no one moment of my life their flatterer, and God forbid that I ever should be.

When the honorable gentleman confides the course we have taken, he must see that the observation he has thus pointed can light on no object. I trust that it did not flow from a consciousness of his own intentions. He, I hope had no view of this fort. If he had he was much, very much mistaken. Had he looked round upon those who honor us with their attendance, he would have seen that the splendid flashes of his wit excited no approbatory smile. The countenances of those by whom we were surrounded presented a different spectacle. They were impressed with the dignity of this house; they perceived in it the dignity of the American people, and felt with high and manly sentiment their own participation.

We have been told, sir, by the honorable gentleman from Virginia, that there is no independent part of this government. That in popular governments the

form of every department, as well as the government itself, must depend upon popular opinion. And the honorable member from North-Carolina has informed us that there is no check for the overbearing powers of the legislature but public opinion; and he has been pleased to notice a sentiment I had uttered. A sentiment which not only fell from my lips, but which flowed from my heart. It has, however, been misinterpreted and misapplied. After reminding the house of the dangers to which popular governments are exposed from the influence of designing demagogues upon popular passion, I took the liberty to say, that we, the Senate of the United States, are assembled here to save the people from their most dangerous enemy, to save them from themselves; to guard them against the baneful effects of their own precipitation, their passion, their misguided zeal. This is for these purposes that all our constitutional checks are devised. If this be not the language of the constitution, the constitution is all nonsense. For why are the Senators chosen by communities, and the representatives directly by the people? Why are the one chosen for a longer term than the other? Why give one branch of the legislature a negative upon the acts of the other? Why give the President a right to arrest the proceedings of both till two thirds of each should concur? Why all these multiplied precautions, unless to check and control that iniquitous spirit, that headlong torrent of opinion, which has swept away every popular government that ever existed?

With most respectful attention I heard the declaration of the gentleman from Virginia, of his own sentiment. "Whatever" said he, "may be my opinion of the constitution, I hold myself bound to respect it." He disdained, sir, to profess an affection he did not feel, and I accept his candor as a pledge for the performance of his duty.—But he will admit this necessary inference from that frank confession, that although he will struggle (against his inclination) to support the constitution, even to the last moment, yet, when in spite of all his efforts it shall fall, he will rejoice in its destruction. Far different are my feelings.—It is possible that we are both prejudiced; and that in taking the ground on which we respectfully stand our judgements are influenced by the sentiments which glow in our hearts. I, sir, wish to support this constitution because I love it. And I love it because I consider it as the bond of our union; because in my soul I believe that on it depends our harmony and our peace; that without it we should soon be plunged in all the horrors of civil war; that this country would be deluged with the blood of its inhabitants; and a brother's hand be raised against the bosom of a brother.

After these preliminary remarks, I hope I shall be indulged while I consider the subject in reference to the two points which have been taken, the expediency and constitutionality of the repeal.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

VACCINE OR COW-POX.

HAVING procured a number of the Vaccines or Cow-Pox, I shall now commence the inoculation; being perfectly satisfied that it will eradicate that principle which the Small-Poxatis on

JOS. BOSEWELL.

Lexington, March 9th, 1801.

FOR SALE AT VENDUE.

ON Friday the 10th instant, will be sold, to the highest bidder, at my farm, on the head waters of Cane Run, two miles and a half from Lexington, a number of

HOGS, HORSES, COWS X

AND YOUNG CATTLE;

A good new WAGGON & GEERS;

Together with all the

FARMING UTENSILS.

A credit of twelve months will be given for all sums over twenty shillings, by giving bond with approved security.

ROBERT HOLMES.

Lexington, March 8, 1802.

FOR SALE,

A LOT in the town of Lexington, situated on the south-east side of Market street, measuring 66 feet front on said street, and 98 feet back; on which is a log dwelling house 16 feet square, with a brick chimney; a small kitchen, and a pump of excellent never failing water.—The houses are to far back as to leave the front of the lot open for building on.—Any person inclining to purchase said lot, may know the terms, by applying to the subscriber, living on the premises.

CATHARINA WOOD.

March 11th, 1801.

December 8th, 1801.

TAKEN up by Jeremiah Wilson, a bay filly, three years old, with a star in her forehead, no brand, thirteen hands one inch high, appraised to 91.

Copy. Telle,

EDMD SEARCY, D. C. W. C.

NOTICE.

THE subscriber, begs leave to inform his friends, and the public in general, that he has moved his STORE, into the large FRAMED HOUSE, formerly occupied by Mr. Amos Edwards, in the town of Paris, directly opposite where he formerly kept; and has on hand a large and elegant assortment of

MERCHANDIZE

Which he is determined to sell as low as any GOODS, offered for sale in this state, of equal quality.—He also returns his sincere thanks to the public, for their friendship and past favors, and still hopes from his affluence to himself, to retain the patronage of his friends and customers in general.

I am respectfully,

the public's friend,

and very humble servant,

WILLIAM SCOTT.

N. B. I have on hand, a large quantity of TURKEY YARN, which I will sell, by the pound or small quantity.—Also, COARSE MUSLIN, by the bale or single piece, CASTINGS, STEEL, COTTON & WOOL CARDS, FUSTIC, RED WOOD, & other DYE STUFFS, for Clothiers.

Paris, March 4th, 1802.

TWENTY DOLLARS REWARD.
STRAYED or stolen from the subscriber, in the neighborhood of Frankfort, on the 16th January, 1801.

TWO HORSES.

The one a dark brown horse, about seven years old five hands nearly one inch high, no white about him, that I recollect; a natural trotter, in rather low order, branded on the near shoulder H, bare-footed; it is a spirited horse, and in good order, would be a valuable addition to any stable.

The other a light foal, owing to my having just purchased him, I can't describe him accurately; it is about fifteen hands high, seven years old, not tall; when he run off, bare footed; he I believe has a lump under his jaws, occasioned by the differernt, and he, when rode, blows remarkably hard, said to be caused by the differernt; which is the most remarkable oddity, I ever recollect; which is the most remarkable oddity, I ever recollect. I will give the above reward for either, or the same proportion for either, if delivered to me at Frankfort, and all reasonable expenses paid by me.

PASCHELL HICKMAN.

March 8th, 1802.

DANVILLE DISTRICT, to wit:
January Term, 1802.

Nathan Hulton,
and
Joseph E. Lewis,
Against
Spencer Griffin,
Defendant.

IN CHANCERY.

THE defendant, having failed to enter his appearance herein, agreeable today and the rules of this court, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court, that he is not an inhabitant of this place; on the motion of the complainants, by their counsel, it is ordered, that the said defendant do appear here, on the 10th day of May next, and pay a copy of the order with which he is charged, in the Kentucky Gazette for two months successively; another copy posted up at the court house door, and a third copy published at the Danville meeting house door, from Sunday immediately after divine service.

Copy. Telle,

WILLIE GREEN, C. D. D. C.

TAKEN up, by the subscriber, on Townfield, two miles and a half from Wilton's mill, Bourbon county,

A BAY HORSE,

Five years old this spring, about fourteen hands one inch high, a little white in his face, and the mane hangs on the near side, no brand; appraised to \$10.00.

JOHN LAIL.

PUBLIC SALE

ON Monday the Twenty-ninth instant, at the Farm of JOHN FOWLER, Esq., will be exposed to sale on a credit of Twelve Months, for all sums exceeding Five Dollars, A WAGGON, THREE HORSES & HARNESS, A Stock of CATTLE, SHEEP & HOGS; A Quantity of Excellent BACON, POULTRY &c. &c. The purchaser to give bond and security for the payment.

THOMAS BODLEY, Agents.

March 10th, 1802.

CUTH BANKS,

TAKE NOTICE.

WE shall attend with the commissioners appointed by the court of Fleming county, on Monday the third of April, between the hours of ten and two, at the mouth of the Mudlick Fork of Johnson, in Fleming county, to establish the calls of an entry, in the name of William Lear, for four hundred acres; and one in the name of John Mobley, for ten thousand, and do such things as the law requires.

Lewis Craig,

John Winn.

March 11, 1802.

BAR IRON—Well assorted.

3 Whole sale or retail, at the SIGN OF THE BUFFALOE,
Lexington, by BENJAMIN WHALEY.

LOST.

ON Tuesday the 9th inst. on the road leading from Lexington, to general William Russell's a RED MOROCCO POCKET BOOK, containing BONDS and other PAPERS, of no use to any person but the owner. My name is wrote in the book. Any person finding it, will please to leave it at Mr. Tegarden's store in Lexington, where they will receive a handsome reward.

THOMAS HANLEN,
Lexington, March 10th, 1802.
2nd J.F.



IS now carried on in my shop, where the subscriber will serve the public with expedition, upon low terms for CASH.

HE HAS A LOT—For Sale.

Near his own house, in good order, fifty feet by fifteen pole, upper end Main-street, Lexington.

BENJAMIN LLOYD.

March 10th, 1802. 4th J.W.

For the information of those who do to make INSURANCE.

APPLICATION for insurance itself shall be accompanied with a certificate, specifying the length and width of the vessel or boat, the cable, stern-fast, number of ears, pump and canoe or skiff, the number of hands, &c. which ought to be given by persons who are judges, and who are disinterested reputable men.

A bill of lading signed by the captain, or a manifest signed by the inspector, which shall specify the whole of the cargo on board, or to be put on board—it must also state where the boat or vessel lies—where she will take her cargo—when she will take her departure; or if she has failed, the time, when, and the port to which she is bound; and if any information has been received from her since the failed, it must be communicated. The insurance does not commence until the vessel is under way, on her intended voyage and the premium paid.

In all cases of loss, if practicable, a survey must be made by disinterested men, who are to state in writing, what in their opinion is necessary to be done, for the interest of the parties concerned; as also a protest to be entered by the captain on oath, in which the hands must join, stating particularly the loss, where and how it happened, and what cargo was then on board.

In case a boat or vessel be lost, it is the duty of the captain and hands, to use all possible means to recover the whole or as much as possible, of the cargo, for which labor and expence, the insurers will pay their proportionable part.

No boat which is insured, must attempt to pass the Falls of the Ohio, without taking a pilot on board.

Any shipper, who intends to tarry at any port or place on the voyage, for the benefit of trading, or other purposes, must have an article to that effect, inserted in the policy of insurance.

Published by order of the Directors,
WILLIAM MACBEAN, Ck.
March 4th, 1802.

THE SHAREHOLDERS

OF the Vineyard Association, are requested to meet at the house of Capt. John Pofflethwait in the town of Lexington, on Saturday the 20th of this instant, (March) at 10 o'clock A. M. in order to elect twelve directors, for the ensuing year, agreeably to the law incorporating the Vineyard Society.

JOHN BRADFORD, President.

March 4, 1802.

NICHOLAS BRIGHT,
BOOT & SHOE
MANUFACTURER.

Returns his thanks to his customers for their past favors, and hopes by his attention to business to merit them in future. He begs leave to inform the public in general, that he has removed his shop next door to Mr. Boggs's opposite cap. Henry Marshall's tavern, on Main street.—The ladies are respectfully informed that they may be supplied with Grecian Sandals, a new and much esteemed improvement, and superior to the former fashions. Other branches of his business is carried on as usual, with neatness and dispatch.

Lexington, February 12.

WAGNON'S

R. B. R. D. L. E. Y. R. E. SPECTFULLY announces that he succeeds Major WAGNON, in the commodious Brick House and Stables, which he lately occupied in this place, with a revision of assistants and servants, arranged to reflectively departments; which together with that peculiar respect shown himself while with Major Waggon, emboldens him to anticipate a patronage from GENTEL GUESTS, ONLY, as durable as his solicitude to please.

Lexington, 13th Feb. 1802.

NOTICE.

One of the subscribers intending to set out for PHILADELPHIA, on the 15th of March ensuing; requests almsdebt to make payment, prior to that time.

SAM'L. & GEO. TOTTER.

12th, Feb. 1802. 4th J.W.

TAKEN up by the subscriber, of the county of Jefferson, on the waters of Hickman, a yellow bay Horse, ten or twelve years old, fifteen hands one inch high, a blaze in his forehead, no brands perceptible; appraised to 213 Jan 21st 1802. Isaac Smith.

FOR SALE,

SEVEN TRACTS OF

LAND,

OF Five Hundred acres each, situated in the Illinois Grant, county of Clark, and Indiana Territory—Those tracts are, on the map of the said grant, by the No. 48, 153, 152, 166, 212, 242, & 262. There is no kind of dispute in the titles to those lands. For terms apply to the subscriber at Louisville.

WORDEN POPE.

February 24th, 1802. 13th J.W.

WANTED,

A QUANTITY OF
MERCHANTABLE WHISKET,
(If delivered at Frankfort would be preferred)

Apply to

MACBEAN & POYER.

Lexington, 16th, Feb. 1802.

KENTUCKY, Paris Decr. 1801.

Robert Johnson, Complainant,
against
Robert Martin & others, Defendants.

IN CHANCERY.

The defendant Martin, not having entered his appearance herein, according to the act of assembly and the rules of this court; and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court that he is not an inhabitant of this Commonwealth—on the motion of the complainant, by his counsel, it is ordered, that the said defendant Martin, do appear here on the second day of the next month, to show cause why he did not appear, and to file with the court a copy of this order be inferred in some one of the Gazettes of this date for eight weeks successively; another copy pasted at the front door of the court house in Paris, and published at the door of the Presbyterian meeting house, in Paris, some Sunday immediately after Divine service.

A copy—Telle Tho. Arnold, C. P. D. C.

2 SIX CENTS REWARD.

TAKEN AWAY from the subscriber, living in Montgomery county, JESSE ARMSTRONG, an apprentice to the Tanning business. He is in his 18th year, about 5 feet 7 or 8 inches high, light brown hair, fair complexion, remarkably knock kneed; who ever apprehends said apprentice and delivers him to me shall have the above reward.

James Haslett.

TAKEN UP by the subscriber, near the mouth of the Knoblick creek, a dark bay Mare, four years old this spring, four feet three inches high, branded on the near jaw, shoulder and buttocks, B, appraised to \$125. April 9th 1801.

John Barnett.

TAKEN UP by the subscriber, one black Mare Colt, two years old next spring, thirteen hands high, the two hind feet white, a small filly, appraised to six pounds.

John Osburn.

Fleming county, Nov. 28, 1801.

NOTICE,

THAT commissioners appointed by the county court of Montgomery county, will meet at the mouth of Buck-Lick creek, a branch of Hinkton, on the 15th day of June next, in order to take the depositions of witnesses, and perpetuate testimony respecting the calls of an entry of one thousand acres of land made in the name of Jenkin Philips, and do such other acts as shall be deemed necessary and agreeable to law.

Jenkin Philips.

March 3, 1802.

NOTICE.

Commissioners appointed by the county court of Fleming, will meet on the 16th day of April next, at the house of James Young, in order to perpetuate testimony to establish the special calls of the beginning of an entry of 983 acres, made in the name of Isaac Pearce, on the middle fork of Flemings creek, in said county, and do such other things as may be necessary and agreeable to law. They will adjourn from day to day until the business is completed.

Alex. Ramsey.

March 11, 1802. 5

TO BE SOLD

ON the premises on Wednesday the 17th day of March next (if not sold on that day it will be rented) the house and lot on Main-street, Lexington, known by sign of the BUFFALO, the property of John M'Nair, dec. occupied for a number of years as a tavern. The building is a two story frame, 33 feet front and 90 back (more or less). This situation is so well known that any further description is unnecessary; it is sufficient to say, that no situation in this town is more eligible for a store or tavern, being in compact order, and having a large stable thereon. Possession will be given on the first day of August next—terms of payment will be made known by the executors.

Also, at said time and place will be sold the lease (for ever) of a two story frame house and lot, opposite the public square, and above Mt. I. B. Brent's tavern. Said lot is 16 feet 4 inches front, and 60 feet back, (more or less) subject to sixteen dollars and twenty five cents yearly. Possession will be given immediately—the terms of payment will be made known at the time of sale.

And at the same time and place will be rented for one year, one five acre lot, opposite Mr. Morton's on Lincolnton road. One five acre out lot, north-east of Rufel's road, and opposite Mr. McCullough's lot. One five acre out lot, on the north west of Rufel's road, and adjoining major Morrison's lot. The above lots are well let, with Timothy and Clover, and well enclosed.

And at the said time and place will be sold a Waggon and Team of five horses—The waggon has not been in use more than six months, and the horses are young and now in compleat order; as also, a compleat set of harness for said horses. Also, at said time will be sold a quantity of Household and Kitchen Furniture and two Stills, 109 and 52 gallons each. A credit of six months will be given by giving bond and security for all sums advanced.

All those indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment; and all persons having any demands against said estate are requested to bring them forward properly authenticated that provision may be made to discharge them.

Jane M'Nair, Executrix.

Robert Patterson, Alexander Parker,

Samuel Ayres, Thomas Wallace,

Leighton, Feb. 19, 1802.

TAKEN up by the subscriber, in Jessamine county, on Hickman creek, near Teagarden's mill, a sorrel Horse, two or three years old, thirteen hands high, fair and trim, two hind feet white, no brands perceptible, appraised to \$15—January 16th 1802. William Anderson.

Mercer, Dec 28, 1801. 13th J.W.

TAKEN up by the subscriber, in Jessamine county, on Hickman creek, near Teagarden's mill, a sorrel Horse, two or three years old, thirteen hands high, fair and trim, two hind feet white, no brands perceptible, appraised to \$12—January 16th 1802. Richard Cress.

Lexington, March 12.

We have information from a source we deem authentic, that no exchange of Louisiana for part of St. Domingo, had taken place on the 31st of December last, between France and Spain; nor was such an exchange at that time contemplated, between those nations. We may therefore rationally conclude, that the present armament destined to St. Domingo from France, is not only to suppress any opposition to the French government, but also to strengthen and fortify that Island against future dangers.

In the House of Representatives, of the U. S. Feb. 18th, 1802, the following report was made by the Committee of Commerce and Manufactures, to whom was referred the petition of THOMAS WALLACE and others, citizens of Kentucky, praying that additional protecting duties may be laid on Hemp, Cordage and Sail Duck, imported from foreign nations.

REPORT—

That your committee have in a former report recommended additional duties on tarred and untarred cordage and yarn; so that the duty payable hereafter may be two cents per lb. on tarred, and two and a half cents per lb. on untarred cordage.—That the present duty on hemp is twenty-two dollars and forty cents per ton; on fail duck twelve and a half per cent ad valorem.—That the duty on hemp is about twenty per cent. on its prime cost

in Europe, which is equal to any protecting duty heretofore laid by law, or now recommended by your committee. The committee are apprehensive that the laying of higher duties on those articles would have a tendency to induce our ship owners to equip their ships in foreign countries, to the great injury of the petitioners, and such other citizens of the United States as may have engaged in the culture of hemp, or its manufacture into cordage or fail duck.

The committee are therefore of opinion, that it would not be expedient to impose further duties on hemp or fail duck.

BY YESTERDAY'S MAIL.

WASHINGTON CITY, Feb. 25.

De Witt Clinton, is chosen Senator of the United States, in the room of genl. Armstrong, resigned. He had 82 votes; and Mr. Clarkson 45. Mr. Clinton is, and ever has been, an unequivocal republican.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 17, 1802.

Mr. Southard presented a memorial from certain counsellors of law, of the State of New-Jersey, praying that the law for the repeal of the judiciary system of the last session, may not pass.—Referred.

A message was received from the president of the United States, enclosing a report from the Directors of the Mint; and statements in relation to the Barbary Powers, containing accounts of all the expenses incurred with them since the commencement of the government.

The House went into a committee of the whole on the judiciary bill: when Messrs. Thompson, Davis and Bacon spoke in favor of the repeal, and Mr. Thomas Morris against the repeal of the law of the last session.

THURSDAY, February 18, 1802.

Several memorials from citizens of Philadelphia were presented, praying that the judiciary law of the last session may be repealed.

The House then resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the judiciary bill, when Mr. Stanly spoke against, and Mr. Giles in favor of the repeal.

On Friday Mr. Bayard occupied the whole of the day, without concluding his remarks, which he closed on Saturday about 3 o'clock; when Mr. Randolph spoke till nearly 5 o'clock; when the House adjourned to Tuesday, on the intimation of the speaker, that a day would be required to have a ventilator put up.

To induce the House to adjourn to that day, Mr. Bayard stated that Monday was the birth day of Washington.

In the House of Representatives the discussion of the bill from the Senate, on the Judiciary was on Tuesday continued. Mr. Huger spoke against, and Mr. Madison for the bill.

When at 3 o'clock a motion was made that the committee rise, and leave it to fit again.

Mr. Gregg said he hoped the committee would not rise. He said it must be evident to every gentleman that the subject was exhausted; and other business of importance claimed the attention of the house.

Miss Goddard, Bacon and Nicholpon, supported the rising of the committee. The motion to rise was carried.—Yea.

CHILLICOTHE, March 6.

Letters were received from Washington City, by last night's mail, to the 22d ult. but contain nothing very interesting. Congress had been eight days engaged on the Judiciary bill, and it was expected that it would not be gone through within less than ten days more. Very little other business was, or would be attended to, until it was finally determined.

From the New-York Gazette.

Captain Wallon informs, that just before he sailed from Charleton, the ship Sifters, Picket, arrived there from Liverpool, from which he sailed on the 1st of January. The news by this ship was of importance, but was not published when captain W. sailed. But there was a great talk at Charleton of a prospect of the renewal of hostilities, in some quarter. He did not, however learn particulars.

From the Baltimore Federal Gazette of Tuesday.

"Captain Hourton informs, that previous to his sailing, the definitive treaty was signed, and a number of English colliers had arrived in the ports, but not permitted to discharge until some commercial points were settled. Several ships of war had sailed from Breit to the West-Indies; the troops it was said would not sail before April."

